

Interview Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/580,025	RAMPINI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NGUYEN, HAIDUNG	1796	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HAROLD Y. PYON. 

(3) JAY ROWE 

(2) HAIDUNG NGUYEN. 

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 March 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: PROPOSED Amendedment CLAIMS 8-9, 11-19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chan et. al, Nuber et al., Watling and U.K Patent ('436).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the prior art of the record. Discussed the claimed " is not charged with a propellant gas". Attorney agreed to change to --without making any use of propellant gases-- as in the specification. The examiner's position is that Watling et al. still read on the proposed amendment. The attorney also agreed to drop the method for dispensing a fluid from a container (claims 17-19) due to original presentation .